EU. EO C.S. DE EU DE REPRT

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA SAVANNAH DIVISION

2010 MARCO MARCO SS

			ou value
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. PRESIDENT GEORGE W.	)	Case No.	CV406-163
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. CITY OF SAVANNAH	) ) ) )	Case No.	CV406-164
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. SHELBY HOOSE	) ) ) )	Case No.	CV406-165
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. ALLISON MARUCA	) ) ) )	Case No.	CV406-166
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. JACK KINGSTON et al	)	Case No.	CV406-174
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. DR. KEITH HALL	) ) ) )	Case No.	CV406-175
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. JOHN T. MULVIHILL	) ) ) )	Case No.	CV406-176
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. PACE MANAGEMENT	) ) ) )	Case No.	CV406-177
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE V. CHARLIZE THERON	) ) )	Case No.	CV406-178

TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE V. DONALD TRUMP	) Case No.	CV406-179
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE V. FBI	) ) ) Case No. ) )	CV406-180
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE V. BEN AFFLECK	) ) Case No. )	CV406-181
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE V. CHATHAM COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT	) ) Case No. ) )	CV406-182
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. CUMULUS BROADCASTING, INC.	) ) Case No. )	CV406-183
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE v. DR. JOHN FABER	) ) Case No. )	CV406-184
TONYA MARIE ARLEDGE V. KROGER	) ) Case No.	CV406-187

## ORDER

After a careful <u>de novo</u> review of the record in this case, the Court concurs with the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation, to which objections have been filed. Accordingly the Report and Recommendation is adopted as the opinion of the Court, and all of the above captioned actions are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

In addition, the Court agrees that it must protect its staff from being mired in the pointless and seemingly endless task of processing Tonya Marie Arledege's voluminous frivolous filings. Consequently, Ms. Arledge must seek leave of the Court before filing any further lawsuits or other pleadings in this District. To that end, the Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to open a miscellaneous file for the purpose of tracking any pleadings submitted by Ms. Arledge. This Order shall be docketed in that file. If Ms. Arledge presents any future pleading to the Clerk of the Court, the Clerk shall receive the pleading and make a notation in the miscellaneous file of such receipt. However, rather than docketing the pleading, the Clerk shall forward it to the undersigned for a determination of whether Ms. Arledge's claims have any arguable merit. Only if the Court allows the pleading to be filed will it be docketed.

so ORDERED, this 232 day of August, 2006.

WILLIAM T. MOORE, JR., CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

 $<sup>^1</sup>$ For the time being, this restriction does not apply to pleadings filed in Ms. Arledge's pending action <u>Arledge v. Potter</u>, Case No. 4:05-CV-161 (S.D. Ga. filed Sep. 7, 2005). However, if Ms. Arledge files a barrage of frivolous motions in that action or attempts to use that action to skirt the restrictions of this Order, the restrictions will be place on her pleadings in that action as well.